

REMARKS

Claims 16-18 and 76-78 were pending at the time of the last Office Action. Applicant has amended claims 16 and 76; canceled claims 17, 18, 77, and 78 and presented new claims 79-88. Thus, claims 16, 76, and 79-88 are now pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrison, Sumita, and Morris. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims to clarify the subject matter of the claims.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner recognizes that Morrison does not describe that “metadata identifies portions within the television program.” (Office Action, July 20, 2009, p. 4.) To cure this deficiency, the Examiner relies on Sumita at 4:43-47 and 11:8-22 and Figure 23. Sumita at 4:43-47 describes that a keyword can be used to search for scenes associated with that keyword. Sumita, however, does not suggest that viewers provide the keywords to be associated with the scenes. Rather, Sumita uses speech recognition techniques to identify what words are being spoken by the performers in the scene and then associates those keywords with the scene. (Sumita, 5:40-51.) Sumita at 11:8-22 and Figure 23 describes how to automatically identify scenes—presumably so that the automatically recognized keywords can be automatically associated with the scenes.

None of the references relied-upon by the Examiner suggests that one group of viewers associates meta data with portions of a television program and another group of viewers can view selected portions of the television program based on searching the meta data provided by the other viewer. The relied-upon references do not describe that a viewer associates comments with portions of a television program or video.

Applicant has further amended the claims to recite a synchronization point that provides a common reference location among different versions of a video or a television program. Independent claim 16 recites “the identification of a portion being

an offset from a synchronization point after the beginning of the television program that serves as a common reference location for offsets among different versions of the television program, the synchronization point being specified by a broadcaster of the television program.” Independent claim 76 recites “the identification of a portion being an offset from a synchronization point after the beginning of the video that serves as a common reference location for offsets among different versions of the video, the synchronization point being specified by an author of the video.” None of the relied-upon references describe such a synchronization point. Moreover, the references have no need to describe such synchronization point because they do not suggest adding comments based on different versions of a television program or video.

Applicant has also amended the claims to clarify that the first viewers are not the broadcaster of the television program in claim 16 or the author of the video in claim 76. This amendment helps clarify the viewers who are independent of the broadcaster and author can add metadata to be used by other viewers in selecting portions to view.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268854US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 10/15/09

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-9000 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant